

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

APRIL DENISE WILLIAMS,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

USA, et al,

*Defendants.*

Civil Action No. 18-14455

**OPINION & ORDER**

**John Michael Vazquez, U.S.D.J.**

Plaintiff April Denise Williams brings the above-captioned action *in forma pauperis* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The Court previously granted Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint<sup>1</sup> and First Amended Complaint without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). D.E. 2 ("First Opinion"); D.E. 3 ("First Order"); D.E. 6 ("Second Opinion and Order"). Plaintiff now brings her Second Amended Complaint. D.E. 7 ("Second Amended Complaint").

In its First Opinion, the Court explained that Plaintiff's allegations were insufficient because they did not plausibly allege any unlawful conduct by any of the named Defendants, and the Court granted Plaintiff leave to amend her Complaint accordingly. First Opinion at 6-15. Plaintiff responded by only adding the following new, substantive information in her First

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff brought five separate Complaints, all with similar factual and legal allegations. The Court consolidated all five Complaints under the above-captioned action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a)(2). The Court then dismissed with prejudice the Defendants immune from suit and dismissed without prejudice Plaintiff's remaining counts.

Amended Complaint: “filing an amendment so my case does not be terminated,” and “[filing under] US Bill of Rights: amendments 1, 4, 9, [and] 10.” D.E. 5 at 2. The Court, in its Second Opinion and Order, explained that this was again insufficient, and granted leave for Plaintiff to file a second amended complaint that cures the deficiencies the Court laid out in its First Opinion. Second Opinion and Order at 1-2.

In her Second Amended Complaint, D.E. 7, Plaintiff again has responded with insufficient factual allegations to plausibly plead a claim against any Defendant. In her three-page Second Amended Complaint, Plaintiff cites to “The Bill of Rights amendments . . . 1, 4, 9, and 10” as her cause of action, but only references, generally, an “alleged USA Government official . . . that had/has government clearance on the electronic weaponry radiation frequencies” as the party that infringed on these rights. Second Amended Complaint at 2-3. Essentially, Plaintiff alleges that this unidentified official “exposed [her] to military electronic weaponry” and “exposed [her] to microwave frequency radiation” that have affected her “cognitive as well as intellectual thinking process[es]” and caused her to have “brain cells that has [sic] no method of growth.” *Id.* at 2.

Again, Plaintiff fails to plausibly plead a claim. She does not identify what individual, in particular, exposed her to this weaponry, how such individual exposed her, when such individual exposed her, or any events surrounding her allegations. The Court has given Plaintiff two opportunities to amend her pleadings and warned Plaintiff that this was her final opportunity to properly plead a claim. Prior Opinion and Order at 2. As Plaintiff has again failed to plausibly plead a claim for relief, the Court dismisses Plaintiff’s Second Amended Complaint, D.E. 7, with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

For the foregoing reasons, and for good cause shown,

**IT IS** on this 8th day of January, 2019,

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint (D.E. 7) is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**; and it is further

**ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court shall serve this Opinion and Order upon Plaintiff by regular and certified mail return receipt; and it is further

**ORDERED** that the Clerk of the Court shall close this matter.

  
John Michael Vazquez, U.S.D.J.